

**MARIN COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY,  
MARIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, AND  
MARIN COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2004**

Representatives Present: Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Annette Rose, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Al Boro, San Rafael City Council  
Barbara Heller, Marin County Transit District  
Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Larry Chu (alternate to Joan Lundstrom), Larkspur City Council  
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council  
Bruce Sams, Belvedere City Council  
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council  
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council  
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council  
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council  
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council

Representatives Absent: Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council  
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Tom Byrnes, Ross Town Council

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, CMA Executive Director  
Art Brook, CMA Deputy Executive Director  
Dean Powell, Principal Transportation Planner, Marin County DPW  
Jason Nutt, Traffic Operations Engineer, Marin County DPW  
Jack Baker, Senior Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW  
Tho Do, Associate Civil Engineer, Marin County DPW  
JeriLynne Stewart, Recording Secretary

**Chairman Steve Kinsey called the Joint Meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.**

1. Board/Agency Member Matters not on the Agenda

None.

2. Approval of Joint Minutes of March 25, 2004 and April 8, 2004

Agency Member Eklund provided minor wording changes to the March 25, 2004 minutes which she gave to staff prior to the meeting; Supervisor Rose asked that the word "inter-city" replace "inner-city" in 3 areas of the collective minutes; and, Agency Member Fredericks asked that "...including all of Paradise Drive..." be added to Supervisor Murray's motion on page 10 of the April 8, 2004 minutes.

**Agency Member Eklund motioned to approve the amended minutes; motion passes 13/0/1. Agency Member Amy Belser abstained (as she was not present at the April 8, 2004 meeting).**

3. Executive Director's Report
  - a. AB 2001

At the September, 2003 Joint Agency meeting, there was action requesting that staff pursue legislation to double the traffic fines in school zones, with the support and aid of Assemblyman Joe Nation. It went through the Transportation Committee and is now in front of the Appropriations Committee.

Agency Member Eklund urged all cities to send a letter to Assemblyman Nation supporting the bill.

4. Reports from Committees

a. SMART – Supervisor Rose

SMART conducted its own transportation/transit poll, the results of which will be discussed at a special meeting at the Petaluma Community Center, 1pm, May 5, 2004. The issue of whether their sales tax measure will be on the November 2004, ballot will be decided upon at a meeting in Novato, 1:30pm, May 19, 2004. August 6, 2004 is the final date to place on the ballot. In order to place the measure on the ballot, it requires the support of 3 SMART Commissioners from Marin County.

Agency Member Tremaine urged the Marin SMART representatives to resist supporting the SMART measure for the November 2004, ballot, and felt it would do irreparable harm to the goal of the CMA. Supervisor Adams agreed with this opinion.

Agency Member Boro explained there are 5 members from Marin on the SMART Board; 2 Supervisors appointed by the Board and 1 representative appointed by the 11 cities of Marin, excluding Novato and San Rafael.

The City of Novato and City of San Rafael have their representatives appointed by their council. As a SMART Board Member, Mr. Boro said he understands the issues raised tonight; he is representing the City of San Rafael as a member of the SMART Board and as a member of the SMART committee on this (CMA) Board.

b. Marin-Sonoma Narrows Policy Advisory Group (PAG)

1. Project Earmark Under Review in U.S. House of Representatives/Senate Conference Committees

Executive Director Tackabery explained that at the recent PAG meeting, there was an action item to support a letter to Congress regarding Earmark; it was brought before this Joint Committee to act on presenting a similar letter to Congress, which would request \$100M for the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project. The City of Novato and County of Sonoma have sent letters to Congress requesting the additional funding.

Supervisor Rose requested this large request be reviewed against other Board of Supervisor requests.

Chairman Kinsey suggested no action be taken on this item tonight and that he would discuss further with staff and Supervisor Murray.

5. Draft Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan

Chairman Kinsey introduced this item by instructing agency members to refer to the Key Policy Questions (KPQ) in their packet. Chairman Kinsey said that one of the most significant issues to discuss, in terms of the allocations in particular, was the fact the Joint Committee agreed to use an increased estimate amount, and referenced #9 of the KPQ.

KPQ #1. Executive Director Craig Tackabery began the discussion with the requirement for local match for infrastructure. Does the Joint Committee wish to require a local match at all, a local match at 20% (as required in the current plan), or another percentage of match. The idea behind the local match would be to leverage sales tax dollars, at the federal, state and local levels.

Bonnie Nelson explained cities' comments on this item were mixed; some, like Novato, supported the local match, and some were opposed to the local match. The objective of having a match was so that sales tax money would simply not replace money from cities' and the County's general fund that are currently being used for roads projects. In order to provide this assurance, the local match requirement was written into the Draft Plan, yet some Public Works Directors and City Managers feel this may be an onerous requirement, given the state of various budgets.

One concern about the local infrastructure program currently in the Draft Plan is attempting to reach the levels of specificity the community wants, and by doing so, the Joint Committee may not be addressing the many other roads not listed/addressed in the system. Therefore, Chairman Kinsey asked that by not having the local requirement, couldn't those dollars then be available to address the issues of roads not included in the Plan. Ms. Nelson said the local dollars could be used for any purpose; it would be at the cities' or towns' discretion.

Agency Member Tremaine expressed concern about the local match from the perspective that given the budget situation now, we may not know if we will have money to match funds for projects we may wish to prioritize. He said he does not think the local match fits with the specificity of the list in the Plan. There are a certain number of roads on the list scheduled for repair; yet, he feels the local match made more sense when there was not a specific list of roads slated for repair. We do not know if we will have matching money to spare to complete non-listed projects.

Agency Member Fredericks agreed with Member Tremaine and added that if there was money from the general fund, we might want to prioritize it for roads which were not slated to receive funding from the Sales Tax Expenditure Plan.

Agency Member Breen said that to put this on the cities, after having listed the roads of countywide significance, means that other projects that would have to be funded by each city and town would no longer get funded because that money would have to be put up for match.

Chairman Kinsey said we do not have enough money to meet all of our roads needs. The priorities listed are very specific; we have a plan of action that involves community oversight. When getting into multiple jurisdictions, does that mean that if one community was unwilling or unable to make a match, that a project which was identified could not go forward? He was supportive of removing the requirement for the match on local infrastructure.

#### Public comments:

Jean Bonander of Larkspur, speaking on behalf of Marin Managers, supported the removal of the match requirement. She said a local match makes sense when you are competing with each other, but this is money for our roads which are all connected. We have had opportunities in the past decade to cooperate with our projects by the County and cities getting together. The match concept interferes with the ability to collaborate within the County.

Nancy McCarthy, President, Marin United Taxpayers Association (MUTA), said they have a problem with supporting the Sales Tax Plan in that it is like 'death by a thousand cuts.' In the past, she said transportation taxes have included rail; they do not know about the 'backfill' from the GGBH&TD which is why the group has concern about rising transit prices. The group sees this as a solid, single issue, and Ms. McCarthy said that by slicing the Plan up into pieces, it allows competition with SMART, etc. She said that instead of providing the community with a solid and complete picture of what their transportation taxes are going to be over the next few years, that the Joint Committee is chopping it up into small pieces, and not providing a global picture that people know when it ends and what is covered, as opposed to add-ons, year after year. She said MUTA vehemently opposes the train. She said that unless there's some sort of commitment by the BOS to not support the SMART measure and the train itself, they will know that even though it doesn't appear on this November's ballot, it will be on the March or November (2005) ballot. She said the Joint Committee owes it to the community to let everyone know exactly what they're getting into in the long term because it appears as if we have half of the transit tax chopped off so that the community can swallow it more easily, and that the other half will be presented down the road. Chairman Kinsey said there is no component investment in the Plan for train.

Agency Member Eklund said the idea of the local match was a concept initiated by Agency Member Swanson. She said Mr. Swanson's comment was that by requiring a local match, that it encourages communities that have not passed a parcel tax to consider doing so for roads. Eklund said Swanson's idea was that it could extend how far this Sales Tax would go in terms of covering some of the streets because there may not be enough money. Agency Member Eklund feels the Joint Committee should consider requiring a match, and maybe 20% is too high, so that maybe we should lower it, just to get a commitment from the cities that are participating in this.

Agency Member Boro agreed with Jean Bonander and supported the removal of a local match. The money put forward for this measure comes from all of the cities; we have an integrated Plan dealing with the streets all across all of the cities, and it makes sense to complete those and not get into competition to complete them.

Supervisor Adams asked if there will be opportunity to revisit this issue once the allocation issues have been discussed. She said she wished to reserve her vote until further discussion about the other allocation issues was completed. She said she was approached about the possibility of looking at the differential that was reported last meeting about the amount of dollars the Joint Committee could expect to recoup. It is possible that a portion of those dollars might be allocated toward the local jurisdictions for their individual decision-making about their road projects. If that were the case, she would still support some kind of a match for these major joint road projects.

Agency Member Fredericks suggested that increment in revenue will help but it isn't going to be such a large contribution toward the shortfall that would make a difference with respect to why one would support a match. She asked to move the question.

Supervisor Rose commented on the fact that a suggestion made at the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting that instead of leveraging funds, we would use "matching" funds wherever possible. Ms. Nelson responded by referring to the Draft Plan, and that the word "matching" is the word now used throughout the Final Draft Plan, and therefore will be used in the Final Plan.

**Agency Member Boro motioned for the removal of the requirement of a local match for the local infrastructure which identifies the corridors and the roads of countywide significance, including bike paths, pedestrian areas, bus bulb-outs, maintenance of the infrastructure, including culverts and other components. Agency Member Tremaine seconded the motion. Motion passed 12/0/2, with Supervisor Adams and Agency Member Eklund opposing.**

KPQ #2: Bonnie Nelson of Nelson/Nygaard Consulting explained the set of performance-based criteria for Safe Pathway Improvements capital projects. Ms. Nelson and staff believe that in order to equitably distribute the funds, we need to include the recommended criteria, although this list is not exclusive.

Agency Member Eklund asked if it was possible to add the criteria that the MCET suggests. Executive Director Tackabery explained that one of the two criteria suggested by MCET was not included in staff's suggested criteria, which was the reduction of the number of automobile trips to school. Ms. Nelson said it was nearly impossible to compute this when referring to a bike path improvement; staff can often estimate the number of users but cannot accurately estimate the auto reduction.

Agency Member Chu questioned #2a, pertaining to identification of safety problems in the vicinity of a school, indicating it is somewhat subjective. He suggested staff add "... and congestion..." to #2a's verbiage, which provides a means to look at the ancillary impact without having to quantifiably measure it. Staff and the Committee agreed.

Supervisor Adams suggested the inclusion of examples as to the types of safety problems in need of addressing: accidents, interactions with pedestrians and automobiles or bikes, injuries, etc.

Public comment from Wendy Kallins, SR2S Program Director, suggested adding to #2b "... or along a major school route". Some safety issues are not actually right in front of the school, yet could be a couple of blocks away, yet still pertain to a safety route. Agency Member Gill asked that the same addition apply to #2c, for consistency.

**Supervisor Adams motioned for performance-based criteria for Safe Pathway Improvements capital projects with the suggested modifications. Agency Member Pat Eklund seconded the motion. Motion passed 14/0/0.**

KPQ #3: Chairman Kinsey suggested some changes be discussed to the Citizens Oversight Committee (OC), including the San Rafael Neighborhood Association's request for a neighborhood representative. As it's currently structured, the OC identifies one member from each of the Planning Areas. There is a Northern Marin representative, who might also be a Neighborhood representative, for example.

Agency Member Eklund asked if "Northern Marin" refers to "Novato", referring to page 27 of the Sales Tax Expenditure Plan. Ms. Nelson said "San Rafael" will be replaced by "Central Marin" for consistency in terms. The reason cities are not being named is because staff is intending to include the unincorporated areas in each of the four Planning Areas designated.

Agency Member Eklund asked how representatives will be chosen for each of the Planning Areas, and if memberships will be advertised. Chairman Kinsey said that once this is passed and we've identified projects, the Authority would be working overtime to find representatives willing to serve on this committee. The Authority will be soliciting representation from each of the geographic areas. The Authority will advertise that citizens can apply; the Authority will consider the applications, and then select representatives.

Supervisor Adams commented on the fact that the environmental communities requested a change to allow the selection of 2 members, one from the urban corridor and one from the rural corridor, yet she said West Marin is not represented. She said she would like to advocate that the Citizen Oversight Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) looking at road issues, would include someone from West Marin, as the West Marin Stage is included in that area. Ms. Nelson referenced page 27 of the Plan, that the planning areas do include a member from West Marin. While there may not be an environmental representative from West Marin, there will definitely be at least one representative from West Marin on the OC. The TAC provides 3 Public Works Directors; one could be a County representative, potentially, out of the 12 Public Works Directors, and one environmental community member, who could be from West Marin. There are no geographically defined memberships; they're functional.

Supervisor Rose suggested that on page 27, it read "... from a taxpayer group".

Agency Member Tremaine asked which environmental communities should be considered. Ms. Nelson said staff has listed environmental organizations of Marin County; the organizations staff has met with, including the Sierra Club, suggested that they would meet and nominate someone. It is possible that we would have multiple and competing applicants, in which case we will want to talk to them and then make a selection. The community organizations will make the nominations; the Authority will make the selection, as the Plan is written now.

**Supervisor Adams motioned to affirm the language from page 27 of the Plan as amended about the make-up of the Citizens Oversight Committee and that representatives from each of the groups identified will nominate their representative to fulfill that position, with one environmental representative; the Authority will then select representatives from those nominated. Agency Member Pat Eklund seconded the motion. Motion passed 14/0/0.**

KPQ #4: Ms. Nelson explained that this is specifically not about the amendment process. This is to respond to misinformation among the public that has been brought to staffs' attention that says "Once you pass this tax, you're going to give the money to the train..." or, "Once you pass this tax, you're going to give the money to the Novato Narrows..." Ms. Nelson suggested we indicate that if we've added any new strategies to the Plan, it would require going back to a vote of the people; or, it can be handled through the amendment process; or we can add some clarifying language.

Agency Member Eklund asked if we might take care of this perception with a clause in the amendment section. Ms. Nelson explained that by strengthening the amendment process, we would address these concerns. She said, however, she's not sure whether this would be good enough, because we wouldn't be specifically naming these controversial projects in that amendment process. Eklund asked if we could say, in the amendment process, "If there's any other projects that are not included in this Plan, they will have to be amended by ..." Ms. Nelson agree that could be a viable suggestion.

Supervisor Adams said there is usefulness in saying what this will not pay for, and that we must be clear. She recommends we identify in the verbiage, "This will not pay for SMART..." "This will not pay for the Narrows..." She said she doesn't feel we're entering a campaign mode. She said she's been asked by a number of groups and organizations whether or not the train or the Narrows will be included in the Plan. It's important to be clear right from the start that this is not what will be included.

Agency Member Boro asked about the intent of this item; is it the intent of staff to come up with the wording for the ballot measure now? Ms. Nelson explained that this item is not to compile the 75-words for the ballot (to which the Expenditure Plan will be attached), this is strictly for the Expenditure Plan. Boro said the ballot measure will refer to the Expenditure Plan, the Expenditure Plan will be explicit as to what it will do. Therefore, Boro asked if it is the intention of staff to include the 'negative comments' as to what the Plan will and will not pay for. Ms. Nelson said that yes, it will be necessary to add something to the implementation guidelines that says specifically what is not in the Plan.

Agency Member Tremaine agreed with Supervisor Adams' suggestion, with the possible addition of "...the only money from the Sales Tax that will be spent on Highway 101 is to close the gap."

Agency Member Eklund also said there was concern and rumor about some of the buses in local transit would be supporting local rail. Therefore, she suggests we say, "This measure will not fund rail or any support systems..."

Supervisor Rose stated that what we need is an intermodal system in this County and pieces of transportation that interact and that are effective with each other. As SMART has gone forward with every design for every station, the buses coming to the stations have been incorporated and will be paid for by SMART. She supported the idea of stating specifically that the rail and the Marin Sonoma Narrows would not be supported by this tax measure.

Agency Member Gill suggested the idea of saying "...nothing on Highway 101 except the Gap Closure..."

Public comments included Don Wilhelm, Novato, a member of MCET, referred to page 30 of the Draft Plan, item #11. Depending upon the outcome of SMART's deliberations, the issue may or may not be eligible due to the verbiage in #11. He said that MCET is familiar with other transit agencies where the agency operates both bus and rail, they essentially cannibalized the bus service in order to force passengers to ride the rail system to overcome the heavy deficits. The Portland Transit System falls into this category. He suggested, on behalf of MCET, wording that identifies specific limits as to how the money would not be spent.

David Schoenbrunn of TRANSDEF: The use of the word "cannibalize" is pejorative and inappropriate. He said what eventual system operates will be the most effective and efficient system.

Chairman Kinsey provided more clarity by referring to the program, the Marin Transit Futures Bus Plan which created the Vision and was a foundation for the current Plan, did not envision that our bus service would be oriented toward serving rail. SMART, for its part, has understood that it needs to develop a support system for the rail, including the bus and Park N' Rides. If SMART moves forward with their measure, they will be defining this for the voters. We have expected that the support system on the transit side for a rail program would be the responsibility of, and the funding would come from, the rail authority.

Agency Member Boro suggested that on page 2 of the Executive Summary, which refers to how a tax will improve mobility the next paragraph should be "What this Plan will not fund".

**Supervisor Rose motioned to implement a guideline stating clearly that the measure will not fund Highway 101 improvements (such as the Marin-Sonoma Narrows) other than the Gap Closure, or improvements related to the rail program/SMART, to be written in recommended section of the Plan. Agency Member Belser seconded the motion. Motion passed 14/0/0.**

KPQ#5: Ms. Nelson next detailed procedures for amending the Plan. The current procedure, required by statute, can amend the Plan by a majority (2/3) vote, following a public hearing and a 45-day comment period. The Authority may have more stringent requirements, as it chooses. Among the options suggested include a process similar to the Expenditure Plan approval, where amending the Plan would require going back to the cities and towns to receive 50%+ of the cities plus 50%+ of the incorporated population and the Board of Supervisors, as is required to adopt a plan. Having just gone through this process just to present information, it is extremely time-consuming and difficult for a small staff. Therefore, Staff's original recommendation was to go with the statute language. Ms. Nelson conducted research with other Authorities to see how often they have amended their plans. In fact, very few amend, if at all. Alameda, San Francisco, Riverside, and San Mateo counties have amended either once or not at all.

There are some other possibilities including a process that would allow for a protest vote, and a city could request that the Authority go through the longer process, allowing for another 45-day period. Staff is open to any process the Authority wants; yet, the public wants to know it will be difficult to amend this Plan.

Agency Member Tremaine is an advocate of sending amendments back to cities, towns, and the Board and feels that is the appropriate way to amend a plan. He does not feel that spending heavy staff time should be required. An adequately worded report sent to all the cities describing what the change is intended to be should suffice, then it would be up to the individual members who sit on these boards to go to their agencies and convince their fellow members that it's a worthy amendment.

**Agency Member Tremaine motioned to implement the Public Utilities Code Section 180207, with the option that in addition to a., a process similar to expenditure plan approval, requiring approval by the Authority, Board of Supervisors, and 50% of the cities and towns representing 50% of the population. Transit Director Heller seconded the motion. Motion passed 14/0/0.**

KPQ#6: Chairman Kinsey said the estimates that have been provided for us, including the revised estimates, have allowed the Authority to bond up to \$30M. One example of how the bonding could be used was presented in tonight's packets; there's no requirement that the Authority would not or could not bond for more than \$30M by making decisions in the Strategic Plan. The presented particulars are simply an illustrative assumption to make the financial plan as conservative and accurate as possible. Therefore, Chairman Kinsey asked if the Authority was comfortable with the estimates provided to it, at least at this level of bonding without having to change the estimate.

**Transit Director Heller motioned to keep the bonding at \$30M. Agency Member Fredericks seconded the motion. Motion passed 14/0/0.**

KPQ#7: Ms. Nelson explained the difference between the Strategic Plan and amendments to the Expenditure Plan. The Expenditure Plan is the blue print which guides the expenditures of sales tax funds over 20 years, and includes broad assumptions about how much will be collected from a sales tax, how much will be used for bonding, and how much projects will cost. The Strategic Plan provides the actual work program with all of the funding, revenue, cost, and financing information that will direct the specific expenditures by the Authority over shorter periods, with substantial detail over a 5-year period and then more general going further out. The Plan is updated every 2 years and will be one of the main activities of the Authority. It is the implementation plan accompanying the Expenditure Plan. Staff is not recommending that the Authority take the Strategic Plan back to the cities and towns every 2 years; there is no Authority in any County in California, which goes through that process.

Don Wilhelm said the Expenditure Plan as it stands now is flexible and even vague, in that it is a 20-year Plan. He said there is major concern among the public about the Strategic Plan being forced into making the tough decisions; to produce the final decisions on how the money is to be spent. He said it is important to get that initial Plan back to the cities so they get the involvement of the broadest portion of the public possible, and get the pressure from the public in its involvement in making the initial decisions which will set the tone for the future Strategic Plans as they're updated. If you limit the review of the initial plan, it's not going to be a burden to staff; it's a one-time process. Mr. Wilhelm urges the Authority to include the approval of the city councils for the initial Strategic Plan.

Supervisor Adams said that if we have a representative here from every city in Marin and representatives from the County, and there is a 45-day notice, then it is incumbent upon the representatives of the cities to go back to their city councils and inform them of the Authority's decisions. The city councils then have the opportunity for input; to bring it to the Authority for discussion, and not drag out the process so that they're blocking the implementation of immediate programs. She supports the Staff's recommendation.

**Agency Member Boro motioned to approve the plan at a noticed public hearing on a draft Strategic Plan, followed by a 45-day comment period prior to approval by the Authority. Supervisor Murray seconded the motion. Motion passed 13/0/1. Council Member Eklund was opposed.**

KPQ#8: Ms. Nelson said this issue was discussed with the polling and outreach consultants who support keeping the Gap Closure in a separate category.

Agency Member Eklund commented that in a previous meeting, reference was made to the Highway 101 HOV Lane and she would like to ensure the Expenditure Plan reflects the term "HOV Lane." Ms. Nelson said that on the advice of the polling and outreach consultant, it was agreed not to use the term "HOV" as is not a common phrase that the public relates to or understands; yet the term "carpool lane" is understood.

**Agency Member Eklund motioned to keep the Gap Closure in its own Strategy to emphasize the importance of delivery the project. Agency Member Breen seconded the motion. Motion passed 14/0/0.**

KPQ #9: Chairman Kinsey said we have worked for four years by developing modal studies, then by creating a vision, then by moving into an agency-based sense of where they'd want to allocate funds for an Expenditure Plan. In early 2003, we committed to outreach in the five geographic regions with Citizens Advisory input, culminating in a presentation in October, 2003, followed by the work we've done since then to be careful, specific, and flexible to maintain a program that will extend over 20 years. In our Special Meeting April 8<sup>th</sup>, we recognized we wanted to adjust our cost estimates to reflect the 2003 values as to what the Sales Tax would bring Marin over a period of time. This resulted in the opportunity to have about \$56M of additional income over the 20-year period.

Chairman Kinsey encouraged that we limit our discussion as to what we might do with the amount of additional money; the \$56M, and not go back and reinvent the Plan. If any adjustments are made tonight, they should reflect the polling.

Supervisor Adams said that at the April 8<sup>th</sup> Special Meeting we talked about the bikeway along the narrow part of the Gap Closure, through the Puerto Hill area. Are the dollar amounts reflected in these numbers? Executive Director Tackabery explained we have been using, for the Gap Closure, an estimate of \$25M. We did not include any additional funds for the bikeway; we do not have an estimate at this time. SMART and Caltrans are still working on the feasibility. Staff reported at the last meeting that \$10M in additional funding would come from MTC to backfill the TCPP funds proposed for deletion by the Governor. Chairman Kinsey referred to page 14 of the Plan, which includes the "Completion of the north-south bicycle way through Puerto Suello Hill to improve bicycle safety and mitigate the impacts of this project". We wanted to make this an eligible project within Strategy 2. Supervisor Adams said she did not wish to lose that piece which was agreed upon April 8<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Nelson said the amounts in the parentheses are straight out of the Release Draft of the Expenditure Plan.

Chairman Kinsey further explained that in response to the crisis in the State, MTC (a regional body) was going to make some STIP backfill allocations using funds available to the region, making them available to some projects, in particular, projects that had anticipated funding from the Governor's TCRP program. In the back-up documents that support the number of \$21.6M, there's \$10M identified for the Gap Closure Project. To the extent that the Governor does not come through with the TCRP money, and it is backfilled, the \$24.75M would drop to ~\$15M.

Executive Director Tackabery clarified that Strategies 2 and 4 were done at a dollar-basis; increasing those may not make sense, yet the other Strategies were done on a percentage-basis.



David Schoenbrunn, TRANSDEF: Strategies #1 and 3 were created on a percentage-basis; Strategy #2 already has a program in there to divide any leftover funds. It was recommended at last meeting to leave the excess amount as a contingency. Therefore, the focus is on school access. The question is whether school access is over funded. The most cost effective element of the entire Plan was removed, which was transportation demand management; using money to encourage people not to drive. He recommends it be put back in; possibly fitting into the Transit Capital section/enhancements.

Mark Riesenfeld, Marin County Administrator expressed his compliments to the Authority for its public outreach and compiling a good package, which has polled well. He said he had concern with respect to the ability to fund the local transportation infrastructure. The collective pressure of budgetary constraints felt by cities and the County has alarmed the Public Works Directors and city and town Managers. The backbone of financing local transportation infrastructure is essentially the Highway Users and Gasoline Sales Tax; a static and non-growth source. Prop 42 and AB2928 have failed to deliver any reliable source of funding. Prop 42 would have provided approximately \$4M per year for cities and towns combined; yet it hasn't delivered a dime, and quite possibly will be suspended even further. AB 2928, which promised to the County budget over \$1M per year, gave it \$400,000 during the first couple of years and nothing else since.

With regard to the County's budget over the last 3 years, there has been a drop in the annual roads fund/revenue accounts of \$3.5M per year. In 2001-02 budget year, there was \$14M available to spend on local roads and transportation infrastructure. This next year, it will be \$7M, which barely maintains any kind of minimal system. The situation is similar with regard to cities' and towns' budgets.

Marin County faces a multi-year, \$150M shortfall just to maintain a local transportation/infrastructure system. Our only hope of addressing the issue is what we can do ourselves. Nothing meaningful is coming from the State or Federal level.

New estimates from revenues of this ½-cent sales tax suggest approximately \$56.6M, when approved by voters. The Marin Managers Association and the Public Works Directors respectfully recommend that this Authority consider a significant allocation of the additional revenue to Strategy 3. Specifically, we recommend an additional \$41.9M to Program 1, and \$4.7M to Program 2. We recommend an additional \$10M to Strategy 1.

We also support the elimination of a required 20% match. The benefits of our recommendations above would give us a reliable resource for local cooperative projects between cities and the County.

County Public Works Director Farhad Mansourian, on behalf of the County Administrator, city managers, and city and towns' Public Works Directors, spoke of their support the Authority's leadership during the transit crisis. They also endorse the proposed Expenditure Plan, which now allocates approximately 60% to transit. They also support the strategy that reflects the Gap Closure Project be fully funded. We now suggest the Authority also recognize the crisis existing within the local infrastructure. Supporting local infrastructure is so much more than simply fixing potholes. Local infrastructure includes roads which provide drainage, pedestrian paths, bicycle paths, accessibility for citizens, safety improvements, traffic signals: anything that serves our walkers, bikers, transit and ferry users, and vehicle users. We have lost every hope we had for the State to assist with funding. Earlier this week, the front page of the SF Chronicle featured an article on Governor Schwarzenegger suspending Prop 42. This is yet another \$4M hit on once-expected local revenue.

Referring to the handout he provided which illustrated minor revisions to pages 18 and 19 of the Draft Plan, Mr. Mansourian said they were not asking to change what took many years to craft. They suggested a title change (page 18) to "Major Roads of Countywide Significance." They are requesting an addition to the second part, "...maintain and improve local roads for all modes;" which is where we suggest the \$41.9M be allocated to this category, to be decided by each city after a public hearing, after they fully take into consideration the bicycle, pedestrian and ADA and all other modes ... to be distributed by the formula listed, which is a combination of city and County maintained roads and population.

Without adding the above allocation and minor verbiage changes, Mr. Mansourian said cities/towns and the County does not collaborate with each other in the existing significant roads category, we compete with each other. With the additional allocation, each city will know how much infrastructure funding is available to them every year, over the life of the Plan. Each city can decide if they wish to bond, to cover a larger project; they can decide to take the money and match it to State and Federal funds; or, similar to what has been done with San Rafael and Larkspur, cities can design and construct projects together. Larkspur and the County completed the East Sir Francis Drake Boulevard project together, which serves our ferry system, because we had steady funds continually available.

This segment of the Draft Plan presented in December 2003 is exactly what we are suggesting be incorporated now. We are not introducing new subjects or content. The Draft Plan as presented then divided the roads into two parts: significant projects such as those listed in the Plan now; and the local roads' allocation based on the formula we're proposing, as even back in December, many of the cities felt they were not getting enough in local return. Using his hometown of Novato as an example, Mr. Mansourian said that by allocating funding according to the formula from December 2003, his City Council could make decisions based on their needs. The decision would be made by Novato's Public Works Director, and the City Council and Transportation Authority.

Agency Member Eklund questioned Mr. Mansourian regarding the bottom of page 16 of the current Draft Plan. Mr. Mansourian explained that as the Draft Plan is now written, Strategy 3 only includes major roads, nothing else. They are suggesting to leave the \$56M portion of additional money alone. The Public Works Directors and Marin Managers Association is asking the Authority to allocate \$41.9M toward Category B and distribute it according to the formula suggested in December, 2003; let the allocation decisions be made by the City Council and/or Board of Supervisor representing the jurisdiction.

Agency Member Eklund asked what the formula was what it was based on. Mr. Mansourian again explained the formula is based on population and road miles within each of the five planning areas. Whenever the Congestion Management Agency received state or federal funds, the distribution of funds was based on the 50-50% formula.

Agency Member Fredericks asked for clarification of the reallocations. Bonnie Nelson said the new allocations would reflect the following:

Transit	53%
Gap Closure	7%
Infrastructure	32%
School Access	7%

None of the strategies above receive extra or less money, even those receiving lower percentages. Agency Member Fredericks asked if Staff would now have to go back to cities and towns to again get their approval for the revised allocations. Ms. Nelson explained Staff has to go back to cities and town for their approval of the total Draft Plan regardless of the Authority's direction tonight.

Agency Member Gill commented on the fact that although everyone wants each of the strategies to receive increased allocations, it doesn't mean that it is possible and questioned whether a 60% allocation of funds for transit is consistent with the polling. She said she strongly agreed with the new allocations listed above.

Agency Member Breen questioned the implementation strategy for reduced school-related congestion. He said this is of concern when everyone already agreed that 21% of Marin's traffic problem is school-related. We have one of the largest support groups of the entire County for this project, based on school access. Mr. Breen said he knows that an increase of \$20M was suggested; he was prepared to approve an increase of \$5M.

Mr. Mansourian explained that part of Strategy 3 is the capital cost for school access. He said it is one thing to have a fantastic program, recognized nationwide, but now we want to implement it by recommending the increase be in the

2<sup>nd</sup> part which is the actual construction piece. Mr. Mansourian said it is important to note their recommendation is not taking away any of the dollar amounts that the Authority approved last time.

Agency Member Tremaine said he found it interesting that the County, under the formula presented, gets almost 40% of the total amount. He said it's significant to note that while it's true that the County has the most mileage of roads, it's also true that the County's mileage of roads are less traveled. There needs to be a more equitable formula that takes into the account the fact that the County's roads are far less traveled upon. Farhad Mansourian reminded the Authority that the formula proposed is one that's been used for 14 years. He said the County-maintained section of Sir Francis Drake (SFD) Boulevard is more used than Ross', San Anselmo, Fairfax and Larkspur combined. It is the 2<sup>nd</sup> most highly traveled stretch of roadway in the County, next to Highway 101.

Mr. Mansourian requested that the Authority authorize and distribute the allocations in such a manner that the County knows its available revenue year to year.

Agency Member Eklund questioned whether all cities and towns use the Pavement Management System. Mr. Mansourian said that indeed, all cities and towns use the same system.

Supervisor Adams commented on the amount allocated for assistance with carpooling and information. Chairman Kinsey said it was a suggestion to provide this within the local infrastructure strategy; the opportunity to have a local TDM program.

Nancy Weninger, VP of MCBC, strongly supported the Public Works Directors' and City Managers Associations' recommendations for an additional \$41.9M to be allocated to Strategy 3. The Expenditure Plan states that each local project will be required to consider the needs of all roadway users, which includes cyclists and pedestrians. All road users will benefit from the increase in allocation. The MCBC also supported increasing the allocation to Safe Pathways, yet they support an amount significantly larger than that proposed. She said that improving roads means more than just filling potholes; it often incorporates safety. In her City of Larkspur, the Public Works Director has projects in mind that redesign key intersections of roads, vastly improving the safety of said intersections, two of which are along Magnolia Avenue. The Public Works Director has applied for grants from several sources over the past several years. Competition for these very limited supplies is enormous; their applications have been denied. A constant, reliable source of funds for the City of Larkspur to have under its own control to use on infrastructure is greatly needed.

Ms. Kallins, Program Director of SR2S, read numerous comments from parents, volunteering in the program. One volunteer asked for a total of \$20M for improvements, to include streets like Tiburon Boulevard, for the life of the Sales Tax Plan. She said unfortunately it is safer for parents to drive their kids to school than if the kids walked, thus adding to the already congested area. Tam High School Traffic Committee also supported more funding for infrastructure on school routes. Tam High and surrounding areas have some of the highest school-related traffic in the County; it will become worse as enrollment increases, and kids travel longer distances to school. Another comment that school buses and crossing guards have virtually disappeared. It is no longer safe for kids to walk along the streets. She said kids who walk to school are healthier and do better academically. Crossing SFD at Ross Avenue or Redhill is extremely dangerous. Cars are allowed to make left turns into the pedestrian crossing at the light. We need "Count down Timers" on the walk lights and light up signs, showing there are pedestrians in the crosswalk. Improvements (in Novato) needed are as follows: school roads, school routes, widened paths or sidewalks, curb cutouts, bike lanes and pedestrian over crossings for Highway 101, more marking, signage and safety devices; improved shoulders and bikeways especially along rural roads. One comment stated \$375,000 per year to provide all of the above is grossly inadequate.

Ms. Kallins stated that a Town Council member, who was not present tonight, is spreading a rumor throughout the county claiming that funding for SR2S is just a "scam" the Authority is using simply to pass this tax measure. She said she and other supporters of the Sales Tax Plan wish to prove the council member wrong. Therefore, SR2S members and volunteers requested the \$20M of the new funding the Authority has be dedicated to Safe Pathways.

They also requested this category be folded into Strategy 4, Safe Access To Schools, to show a higher percentage of the overall tax going toward School Access.

Roz Haymer, head of Marin Horizon School, said she supported raising the percentage of allocation for infrastructure as it will hopefully get kids (and their parents) out of their cars and walking to school, especially along main arteries like Miller Avenue and Blithedale. Until routes are safe, parents will not get out of their cars.

Andrew Thompson said his concern was lack of flexibility. He said that he's witnessed large pots of money being put out to special projects, and too much money being spent on just one project. He supported the allocations the Public Works Directors et al recommended for infrastructure. Yet, he felt naming the streets slated for improvement would "handcuff" the Authority to certain projects and funds could be wasted. He also supported the views of SR2S leaders. He had concern about the 4% going to SR2S and then 5% of that going to crossing guards. He said there's too much in one spot and not enough in other spots. He suggested wiping out the two categories and making them one large category.

Bonnie Nelson explained how to achieve moving money for the crossing guard program into the education program, called SR2S. There are two options on how to move monies within the same Strategy. One would be if one of the elements of a Strategy were over funded; for example, if 50 crossing guards were needed when 70 guards were suggested, reallocating the extra money originally slated for the 20 extra guards does not require any unusual action on the part of the Authority. If the Authority wanted to shift percentages within a Strategy for other reasons, not because one element has become over funded, that could be achieved via the Plan Amendment process.

Kim Basich, Associate Director of MCBC, expressed wholehearted support for the Sales Tax, and supported the recommended \$41.9M added to Strategy 3. She emphasized the fact that the recent polls showed the #1 reason people supported the tax is due to the Safe Pathways component. She urged the Authority to listen to what the voters are asking for and recommended \$20M for Safe Pathways.

John, MCBC member, Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee member for City of San Rafael, supported the recommendations of the MCBC, and having ridden his bicycle to school for the past 5 years, said there is no safe way to get to school within the San Rafael city limits. \$20M would benefit all Marin County bicycling students, and even get more kids on their bicycles and out of cars.

Jean Bonander, Larkspur, said she's been a public servant in Marin for 15 years. She's chaired the CMA's TAC, where, when they did have State and Federal funding, they were able to allocate the funds among the community. Every member of the current Authority once directed their staffs to provide the TAC with viable, thoughtful, well-crafted transportation programs that they were able to support and find funding for in every single community. She said she has faith in and trusts the Authority to do the right things with the transportation projects. She strongly encouraged the Authority to consider the additional component of \$41.9M for local roads.

Rod Gould, Marin Managers Association, said the cities supported the formula recommended earlier. He said that most of the smaller cities and towns would not see a cent of the \$56M under the system of distribution presented in the current Plan. The addition of the \$41.9M distributed based on the formula would ensure the smaller cities and towns would participate in and benefit from this program. Mr. Gould said it is very costly to make significant road improvements. Last year, the City of San Rafael improved a mile-long stretch of Lincoln Avenue – road, gutters, and partial sidewalks – at a cost of \$1M.

Andy Preston, City of San Rafael Public Works Director, also supported the additional funding for local infrastructure. He said that once the Sales Tax Measure is passed, citizens will immediately begin to ask, "When are you going to pave my street"? With the existing draft of the Plan, the answer to the question would be "Never," since all of the funding would be allocated to the "Roads of Countywide Significance." Mr. Preston listed the elements of improvement in an infrastructure system, including intersection and drainage improvements, etc. The amount for each jurisdiction will be minimal, according to the Plan as it is currently written. He reminded the Authority it is the local road system on which the people of Marin want their money spent. Presently, Countywide, MTC reports there is a

\$250M shortfall for local roads. In addition, every dollar spent now will cost \$5 (per square foot) in the future, due to the depreciation curve on a local road.

Dave Schoenbrunn provided a counterpoint to the view of the Public Works Directors. Even if the Authority accepted their recommendation, it doesn't actually solve their collective problem, it simply eases the pain. He said the dysfunctional problem is the fault of the dysfunctional State. He said this Measure is an opportunity for the Authority to express vision and thereby attract voters. He felt this element would not excite voters.

Don Wilhem said that as a result of the proposed allocations, the percentages changed. The only reason we have extra money to discuss is because there's an updated forecast as to what the total revenue would be over 20-years. One or two years from now, the forecast may be lower. If we change the percentages as proposed – it is percentages which dictate spending patterns – we will have less monies for transit, and other Strategies. He felt that everyone at the Transportation Workshop in 2003 were speaking in terms of percentages, and that everyone would be disappointed to learn that after all of their work, at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, there's a change in percentages. There still is no change, however, in the needs.

Wayne Bush, City of Mill Valley, said Mill Valley's City Council had serious concern about the apportionment of the local roads money. He said the Council would support the proposed allocations in that it would give control back to each of the cities and towns. He said the benefits of the new percentages give each jurisdiction control to spend whatever it needs. He also supported the formula as presented above. The roads will fall apart. How much congestion will there be when the roads become impassable?

Bill Whitney, Town of Fairfax, said in 1999 the voters in Fairfax passed a bond measure for their streets & roads, albeit woefully inadequate, in helped to begin to improve their condition. At the time, Fairfax had some of the most poorly maintained roads in the Bay Area. After four years of diligent work, the roads are now average, comparatively. Therefore, in 16 years, Mr. Whitney felt the roads' ratings would be back on the bottom.

Pat Echols, Town of Tiburon, said one thing has slightly changed since the original infrastructure allocation. The poll conducted indicated that SR2S and local roads rose in proportion to what original expenditure allocations were. In Tiburon, under the existing formula strictly for "Roads of Countywide Significance", Paradise Drive would really be the only potential road affected.

Rocky Birdsee, Marin Center for Independent Living (MCIL), had concerns about the percentages. As this is an estimate of increased revenue, what happens if the estimate are unreal or go down? For example, paratransit is not fully funded. He suggested that if the Authority is going to reallocate, choose a lower number to keep the percentages high in other categories, so if there is lower sales tax revenue in the future, everything will still be kept running. In addition, Mr. Birdsee said the MCIL supported any allocations which go toward improving pedestrian infrastructure, including accessible access to and on sidewalks.

Hamid Shamsapour, City of Larkspur, said the beauty of supporting increased allocations to local streets is that local streets provide a little something for everyone. On every roadway project, he and fellow engineers consider the storm drainage systems & flood control; pedestrian safety and accessibility; wheelchair ramp accessibility; bike path and bikeway systems; traffic circulation, traffic movement and parking; street lighting; telecommunication and other utilities going underground; bus shelters and bus turnouts; and, landscaping & beautification. Local streets represent the quality of life in local neighborhoods. Supporting local streets means supporting local quality of life.

Chairman Kinsey referred to a draft of a letter from GGBH&TD. At last meeting, the Authority agreed it wanted to make intra-county bus services to San Francisco eligible for receiving portions of the transit funding. The provision for that is included in the Plan (page 10). "Services between the County and San Francisco on the Highway 101 corridor "provide for both regional and local mobility. These services could also be funded under this category, provided the GGBH&TD maintains the toll revenues that currently funds regional services." If we are going to make additional investments in inter-county service, we want it to be improvements in the bus services. We are looking for

maintenance of effort on the part of GGBH&TD. The specific language is not what the GGBH&TD desires; Chairman Kinsey requested staff work with the District to find specific language which meets the intent.

David Schoenbrunn had concern that what the General Manager of the Bridge District proposes will end up as a cap on the contribution to transit service. As cost continues to rise, there will be less and less transit service over the years. The General Manager's proposal is not acceptable. Mr. Schoenbrunn asked the Authority to direct staff to insist on something else, like revenue hours of service; or the percentage of the toll revenues that actually go into public transportation.

David Pilpel, with regard to the Bridge District's e-mail, said that in the first sentence the word "employers" could be typo, and should be "employees". He said he would strike the language "...toll revenue subsidies equivalent to the amount of toll dollars provided for public transportation from current toll revenues; and replace it with "...revenue vehicle hours or service hours of bus and ferry transit service to, from and within Marin County." Mr. Pilpel will provide the suggestions to staff for consideration.

Supervisor Brown asked if there was consensus that the MMA/MPWA recommendation put forward is generally acceptable to the majority of the agency directors, in an effort to avoid time-consuming conversation. Chairman Kinsey asked for Director's comments to relate to the recommendation and identify where they would vary from the recommendation, if they did not agree with the recommendation.

Supervisor Adams had concerns as to how this will look to the voters. Cities do have the option to go to their voters for assessments for roads; sales tax is volatile, and local return from earlier discussions was viewed as being confusing. She does not believe we have enough dollars in our transit allocation as it is, especially considering Express Bus additions. She does not recall the Authority ever taking the TDM piece out of the Plan. If it requires an extra allocation of funds to put it back a portion of those dollars should go back, under Transit. If there is consensus to accept the recommended allocation proposal, she asked that the Authority reconsider any reallocation of extra funds from the Gap Closure Project to be completely directed toward transit-oriented services.

Supervisor Rose said that on page 23, the side bar paragraph, Mill Valley is listed with Tiburon Blvd.; it should say Southern Marin and not Mill Valley. "Ross and Southern Marin" should just read "Ross Valley." She said that as she understood it, there is a suggestion that the Authority put the capital funds from Safe Pathways into Strategy 4, bringing its allocation to 12.5%. It may appear more clear to the voters as to how much and for what monies will be allocated if the two are combined. She supported this allocation recommendation. She generally supported the Public Works and responded to the Managers' recommendation for infrastructure allocation, yet would be interested if others had slightly different ideas about that allocation.

Agency Member Boro responded to the comment "...people won't be excited about a road element," yet the first thing the polls shows which does excite the people is Highway 101 – a road element; the second thing people are excited about is the local roads element. WE have 240,000 cars in this County, and 260,000 people using their cars who are using the roads. The roads need to be maintained. At a prior meeting, we had a proposal before us without this addition money that did not address the issue of local roads. We understood, at that time with the dollars we had, that the approach then was the best use of funds. We now have additional dollars. We are honoring the work of our collective committees throughout the community who said they wanted the majority of funds going toward transit; the majority of the money is still going to transit. We all know about our respective cities, and know what our people are going to vote for and what they will not; people are looking for a reasonable balance. We are not changing significantly the intent of this Plan by addressing the concerns of the people that are interested in having their local roads improved.

Agency Director Eklund was concerned about how this will look to voters. She said we needed more money for transit; adding \$10M as proposed by the Managers does not go far enough. She questioned why Safe Pathways to School Projects was not combined into Strategy 4 to begin with; she does not remember the rationale. She supported folding component 2 of Strategy 3 into Strategy 4, as it gives more flexibility within the Strategy as to how monies for safer access to schools and funds for Safe Pathways to School projects can be spent. Agency Director Eklund said that

if there is consensus among Authority to put more money toward roads, then she would like discussion on different allocation, or, making sure that any money not used on Gap Closure would go directly, 100% to the transit strategy.

Chairman Kinsey clarified for Agency Member Tremaine that on page 17 of the Plan in Strategy 3, before tonight's adjustments were proposed, \$6.9M was allocated for Safe Pathways to School; the recommendation was from the public that that number be increased to \$20M, or, an additional \$13.1M of the \$56M which we have to allocate. Agency Member Tremaine said that it does in fact, compete with the City Managers' proposal. Chairman Kinsey clarified further the fact that the Authority could accept the Managers' proposal and the Safe Routes proposal by not having any significant increase in Transit. Agency Member Tremaine was not happy about this possibility. Agency Member Tremaine said that his Council told him that if he did not find a way to get increased monies for local road, then Fairfax will not support this proposal. Member Tremaine said he wants to see Fairfax support this; he will have to vote in favor of increasing the percentage of allocation for infrastructure. He was disturbed by the lowering of the transit percentage. He said we do not know if the sales tax revenues are going to be higher than they were initially. He said we had thought through the percentages clearly already. Member Tremaine said dropping Transit 7% was huge, and that if these figures do not pan out, we are reducing our ability to implement an improved transit system.

Agency Member Belser said that to tinker with the percentages now is what we feared ages ago. She said that to conduct polling and not pay attention to it is foolhardy. The polls have already said something to us about local roads, and Safe Routes to Schools. One of her Councils' concerns was over-promising. What the Managers have suggested makes it more likely that they will see something out of the Plan by adding to the infrastructure. Member Belser said she's inclined to support the proposal for local roads and that it promotes the certainty of funding, and the decisions come from the local entities; it's what voters do care about. She also supported moving Safe Pathways to Strategy 4.

Agency Member Chu said we have a lot of constituents we need to serve and when looking at both sides, unless we come together and support this, regardless of what we get, we will all get nothing. He supported the combination of Safe Pathways to School into Strategy 4. He also supported the proposal from the Managers and Public Works Directors. He supported money going back to the local communities. He sees this as being a credibility issue; the citizens see something tangible in terms of what they are going to approve. Each community can decide what the highest priorities are, and take the money and place it into a road, or a school route and apply the money immediately.

Agency Member Breen said under the proposal nobody loses anything, and everyone gains. We maintain the political and emotional support of the largest part of our community. He said he supported the \$41.9M moved to Public Works related activities, but he wants to see the Safe Routes piece raised to \$15M, to maintain the integrity of the process we started a long time ago.

Agency Member Sams said that on page 9 of the Plan, under the "Priority Projects", that Belvedere be included with Tiburon as being eligible to have neighborhood scaled shuttles. He felt dismay in changing the allocation percentages. He said we worked hard to get it where it is in the first place. We talked about how appropriate it was; he does not know if the virtues of the argument are any different than before; we just have more money. We have the option of going with the same percentages or changing them. Belvedere has taxed its citizens to take care of its own roads. We do not find ourselves in the same desperate situation as other cities. He would not want to see it all go to the local transportation infrastructure. He would like to see more going to Safe Access to Schools. He said his major concern about the future, for the Authority, is transit. He supported an increased percentage to Strategy 3, but not the entire amount.

Agency Member Gill said that on page G-1, she had issue with the term "matching" and would prefer the term "leveraging". She supported the Managers' proposal. She said it is important to support transit constituents yet it did not poll that way; we have a poll and we should look at it, if we want this thing to pass.

Transit Director Heller supported the Public Works Directors' proposal; that if we wanted to change the percentages, that's fine; someone should be figuring out the new percentages, then, and start tweaking right now.

Agency Member Fredericks said Tiburon remains concerned about the local allocations to local roads. Funding is not just inadequate it is woefully inadequate. Most of the communities with dedicated funding for roads, from either municipal services taxes or from bonds, will still have a problem keeping their road infrastructure from deteriorating further and being more expensive per mile to repair. Keep in mind the difference between repairing a pothole in a cul de sac and resurfacing a collector street that is not of Countywide Significance, but will bear the community shuttles and buses that service the area. We need to pay attention to the polls. The polls tell us that local roads are important. She pointed out that we are talking about allocating, rather than reallocating everything. This change is about revenue increment. She supported our Public Works Directors' proposal. Regarding the Safe Pathways issue, she say 3 possibilities; 1) move it back to School Access, and keep the School Access at 9%; 2) move Pathways to School Access and increase the amount of allocation, coming from the revenue increments; and 3) leave it where it is in Infrastructure and let it share in the increment there.

Chairman Kinsey recapped with the fact there is support for increasing infrastructure and support for Safe Pathways program. There are concerns about keeping faith with the percentages. The one simple thing to begin with, is that, with the total amount we have, we are all comfortable with the Gap Closure remaining the same. Suggested new working percentages and dollar amounts are listed below in the model:

STRATEGY	NEW PROPOSED PERCENTAGE	AMOUNT
1, Transit	55%	182.38
2, Gap Closure/HOV	7%	24.75
3, Infrastructure	27%	89.53
4, School Access	11%	36.48
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%	\$331.60

In a memo received by MTC, Chairman Kinsey explained the projections Nelson/Nygaard have presented continue to be more conservative than any of the other communities have used with projections of sales taxes.

Agency Member Tremaine said if we are going to accept a change in percentages and the Gap Closure is funded completely, then he supported splitting the additional funds 50-50: 50% into roadways and 50% into Safe Pathways.

Agency Member Eklund questioned the working proposal suggested by Chairman Kinsey, in that does it assume if the money from the Gap Closure is received from elsewhere that the money would be split between transit and roads, or would it b 100% transit? Agency Member Eklund said if we got money from the Gap Closure elsewhere that it could go 100% toward transit. In the Workshop, the money we identified – the \$165M – was going to do what we have now, in terms of the type of service; maybe a marginal increase in service. The more money we can put into transit, the better our communities will be served. We need to think about getting people out of their cars.

Supervisor Adams heard general support for increasing the infrastructure amount, she supported 55% transit. She said she did not want to lose the thread of the TDM issue in this. If there is any excess Gap Closure money, that is be shifted into transit. She was not convinced about what the projections are, and is concerned that we may not be able to improve transit. She supported shifting money toward the infrastructure piece because the Gap Closure project also includes consideration of this bike route way which connects northern and southern San Rafael.

Agency Member Boro questioned the original numbers for Safe Routes to Schools, both capital and operating; the guards as well as the education, which was \$31.7M. In that original plan, it was about 11% of the total. Ms. Nelson explained the intent which comes from both the bicycle advocates and the Public Works Directors was to increase the amount of Safe Pathways capital, so the assumption is all of the increaser for the Safe Routes category would go into the capital. This is consistent with both what the City Managers, Public Works Directors and bicycle advocated requested. S. Nelson said the money allocated to Safe Pathways would not be used for road improvements it would be used for bicycle pathways and crosswalk/sidewalk improvements; these would be things that come out of the Safe



Routes program that are developed with the Public Works Directors. Agency Member Boro supported the percentages shown in the table above.

Agency Member Chu asked if the money in the Strategy 4 get allocated by district or by individual areas, or by municipality. Ms. Nelson said the money is not allocated by districts, and that projects are generated by individual schools during their Safe Routes process. We have no geographically allocated, although geographic equity is one of the criteria Member Chu supported the percentages shown in the table above.

Chairman Kinsey said support leaned toward the table above, with the understanding that if there were additional dollars in the Gap Closure proposal they would move to transit, and, with the understanding that Safe Pathways would mover from Strategy 3 into Strategy 4, and would be included in the 11% allocation. It would increase the Pathways program by \$5M, and it would allow pathway projects to be considered in the selection of local infrastructure projects. Under the Infrastructure strategy we would be providing 2 categories which would split allocations 50-50: 1) programs pertaining to roads of countywide significance, and 2) programs on the road mileage/population formula.

**Agency Member Breen motioned to approve the new proposal, as detailed in the table above, and that Safe Pathways would move from Strategy 3 into Strategy 4. Agency Member Sams seconded the motion. Motion passed 14/0/0.**

**Transit Director Heller moved that any excess funds from Gap Closure go 100% into Transit. Agency Member Eklund seconded the motion. Motion passed 13/0/1. Agency Member Tremaine opposed the motion.**

Ms. Nelson said if anyone has minor wording comments on the Plan they wish to be included in the Final Plan by next meeting, she must have them by noon tomorrow by e-mailing Executive Director Tackabery.

- b. Executive Director Tackabery requested there be a motion to decide on the name of the Authority.  
Chairman Kinsey said the name TAM resonated with everyone. The logo of the Authority will be left up to Dean Powell.

**Agency Member Fredericks motioned to adopt the Transportation Authority of Marin as the agency name. Agency Member Gill seconded the motion. Motion passed 14/0/0.**

6. Open Time for Items Not On The Agenda

None.

**Chairman Kinsey adjourned the Joint Committee meeting at 11:30 p.m.**

## MARIN COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

**THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2004**

Representatives Present: Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors  
Larry Chu (alternate to Joan Lundstrom), Larkspur City Council  
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council  
Bruce Sams, Belvedere City Council  
Al Boro, San Rafael City Council  
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council  
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council  
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council  
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council  
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council

Representatives Absent: Supervisor Cynthia Murray  
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council  
Tom Byrnes, Ross Town Council

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, CMA Executive Director  
Art Brook, CMA Deputy Executive Director  
Dean Powell, Principal Transportation Planner, Marin County DPW  
Jason Nutt, Traffic Operations Engineer, Marin County DPW  
Jack Baker, Senior Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW  
Tho Do, Associate Civil Engineer, Marin County DPW  
JeriLynne Stewart, Recording Secretary

**Chairman Steve Kinsey called the CMA Meeting to order at 11:31 p.m.**

7. Board/Agency Member Matters Not On The Agenda

*(Continued to next meeting.)*

8. Approval of CMA Minutes of March 25, 2004

*(Continued to next meeting.)*

9. Executive Director's Report

*(Continued to next meeting.)*

10. Adopt Regional Transportation Plan (Transportation 2030) Project List

*(Continued to next meeting.)*

11. Adopt Resolution Approving Initial Project Report for Regional measure 2 – U.S. 101 Greenbrae Interchange / Larkspur Ferry Access Improvements

*(Continued to next meeting.)*

12. Award of Projects for Transportation Funds for Clean Air Program

Staff recommended approving all five projects shown in the table presented. The total available TFCA 40% Funds FY 04/05 is \$856,207. The Agency's approval of the above projects creates an unallocated amount of \$402,989 for next fiscal year. Staff also recommended adopting the attached Resolution authorizing submittal of proposals for AB 434 funds.

**Agency Member Fredericks moved to approve the projects. Agency Member Gill seconded the motion. Motion passed 10/0/0.**

13. Open Time for Items Not On The Agenda

None.

**Chairman Kinsey adjourned the meeting at 11:40p.m.**